APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/692,394	10/19/2000	Mansoor Abdulali Lakhdhir	AUS9-2000-0398-US1	6086

35525   7590   08/02/2004

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER
BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/692,394	LAKHDIR, MANSOOR ABDULALI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Benjamin R Bruckart	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 June 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8, 13-25 and 30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8, 13-25, 30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *20040625*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-8, 13, 18-25, 30 are pending in this Office Action.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed on June 25, 2004 has been considered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 13-25, 30 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

<u>Applicant's invention as claimed</u>:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 13, 15, 17-22, 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,169,992 by Beall et al (Applicant IDS).

Regarding claim 1, a method in a data processing system (Beall: Figure 1, tags 112, 118; clients; col. 18, lines 54-62; Figure 8) for communicating across a firewall with a host (Beall: col. 22, lines 17-26), the method comprising:

simulating a browser in the data processing system to form a simulation (Beall: col. 12, lines 50 – col. 13, line 5), wherein the browser being simulated is able to communicate through the firewall (Beall: col. 22, lines 40-53), and wherein simulating the browser includes preparing an encoded data stream similar to one that is sent by an actual browser (Beall: col. 12, lines 61-67; col. 3, lines 39-41); and

communicating with the host directly using the simulation instead of using the browser (Beall: col. 12, lines 50- col. 13, line 5), wherein the step of communicating with the host includes sending a message in which a header field is set to specify the type of data in the body of the message (Beall: col. 18, lines 63- col. 19, line 21; message is the packet, header field Figures 9, 11, tag 5110; packet type, tag 5102).

Regarding claim 2, the method of claim 1, wherein the simulating and communicating steps are performed by an applet (Beall: col. 12, lines 52-57).

Regarding claim 3, the method of claim 1, wherein the applet is a Java applet (Beall: col. 11, lines 6-15).

Regarding claim 4, the method of claim 1, wherein the communications step is performed using hypertext transfer protocol data streams (Beall: col. 18, lines 32-51).

Regarding claim 5, the method of claim 1, wherein the simulating step includes creating a universal resource locator connection with the host (Beall: col. 11, lines 54- col. 12, line 4; TCP/IP connection; col. 22, lines 41-53).

Regarding claim 7, the method of claim 1, wherein the message is used to open a universal resource locator connection to a program on the server (Beall: col. 18, lines 52-67; Figure 12; col. 22, lines 61- col. 23, line 8).

Regarding claim 8, the method of claim 1, wherein the step of communicating includes sending a message with a universal resource locator identifying a program to receive the data (Beall: col. 22, lines 41-col. 23, line 8).

Regarding claim 13, a data processing system (Beall: Figure 1, tags 112, 118; clients; col. 18, lines 54-62; Figure 8) comprising:

a bus system (Beall: col. 45, lines 39-41; buses are embedded in computer architecture);

a communications unit connected to the bus, wherein data is sent and received using the communications unit (Beall: col. 45, lines 34-41; Figure 8, tag 2102);

a memory connected to the bus system, wherein a set of instructions are located in the memory (Beall: col. 45, lines 26-34; Figure 8, tag 2106); and

a processor unit connected to the bus system (Beall: col. 45, line 24; Figure 8, tag 2109), wherein the processor unit executes the set of instructions (Beall: col. 45, lines 20-26) to simulate a browser in the data processing system in which the browser being simulated is able to communicate through the firewall and communicate with the host directly instead of using the browser (Beall: col. 12, lines 50 – col. 13, line 5; col. 22, lines 40-53; col. 3, lines 39-41), wherein the step of communicating with the host includes sending a message in which a header field is set to specify the type of data in the body of the message (Beall: col. 18, lines 63- col. 19, line 21; message is the packet, header field Figures 9, 11, tag 5110; packet type, tag 5102).

Regarding claim 15, the data processing system of claim 13, wherein the processor unit includes a single processor (Beall: col. 45, lines 23-26; Figure 8).

Regarding claim 17, the dataprocessing system of claim 13, wherein the communications unit is an Ethernet adapter (Beall: col. 11, lines 54-61).

Regarding claim 18, a data processing system (Beall: Figure 1, tags 112, 118; clients; col. 18, lines 54-62; Figure 8) for communicating across a firewall with a host (Beall: col. 22, lines 17-26), the data processing system comprising:

simulating means for simulating a browser in the data processing system to form a simulation (Beall: col. 12, lines 50 – col. 13, line 5), wherein the browser being simulated is able to communicate through the firewall (Beall: col. 22, lines 40-53), and wherein simulating the browser includes preparing an encoded data stream similar to one that is sent by an actual browser (Beall: col. 12, lines 61-67; col. 3, lines 39-41); and

communicating means for communicating with the host directly using the simulation instead of using the browser (Beall: col. 12, lines 50- col. 13, line 5), wherein the step of communicating with the host includes sending a message in which a header field is set to specify the type of data in the body of the message (Beall: col. 18, lines 63-col. 19, line 21; message is the packet, header field Figures 9, 11, tag 5110; packet type, tag 5102).

Regarding claim 19, the data processing system of claim 18, wherein the simulating and communicating means are located in an applet (Beall: col. 12, lines 52-57).

Regarding claim 20, the data processing system of claim 18, wherein the applet is a Java applet (Beall: col. 11, lines 6-15).

Regarding claim 21, the data processing system of claim 18, wherein the communication means uses hypertext transfer protocol data streams (Beall: col. 18, lines 32-51).

Regarding claim 22, the data processing system of claim 18, wherein the simulating step includes creating an universal resource locator connection with the host (Beall: col. 11, lines 54- col. 12, line 4; TCP/IP connection; col. 22, lines 41-53).

Regarding claim 24, the data processing system of claim 23, wherein the message is used to open a universal resource locator connection to a program on the server (Beall: col. 18, lines 52-67; Figure 12; col. 22, lines 61- col. 23, line 8).

Regarding claim 25, the data processing system of claim 18, wherein the means of communicating includes sending a message with a universal resource locator identifying a program to receive the data (Beall: col. 22, lines 41-col. 23, line 8)

Regarding claim 30, a computer program product (Beall: col. 45, lines 26-32) in a computer readable medium (Beall: col. 45, lines 26-32) for use in a data processing system (Beall: Figure 8, tag 112; Figure 1, tag 112) for communicating across a firewall with a host (Beall: col. 12, lines 50 – col. 13, line 5; col. 22, lines 40-53; col. 3, lines 39-41), the computer program product comprising:

first instructions for simulating a browser in the data processing system to form a simulation (Beall: col. 12, lines 50 – col. 13, line 5; col. 22, lines 40-53; col. 3, lines 39-41), wherein the browser being simulated is able to communicate through the firewall (Beall: col. 22, lines 40-53), and wherein simulating the browser includes preparing an encoded data stream similar to one that is sent by an actual browser (Beall: col. 12, lines 61-67; col. 3, lines 39-41); and

second instructions for communicating with the host directly using the simulation instead of using the browser (Beall: col. 12, lines 50- col. 13, line 5), wherein the step of communicating with the host includes sending a message in which a header field is set to specify the type of data in the body of the message (Beall: col. 18, lines 63- col. 19, line 21; message is the packet, header field Figures 9, 11, tag 5110; packet type, tag 5102).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,169,992 by Beall et al (Applicant IDS) in view of U.S. Patent No 5,973,696 by Agranat et al.

Regarding claim 6,

The Beall reference reference teaches a method in a data processing system (Beall: Figure 1, tags 112, 118; clients; col. 18, lines 54-62; Figure 8) for communicating across a firewall with a host (Beall: col. 22, lines 17-26) with a message with a header.

The Beall reference does not explicitly state the header is a MIME field.

The Agranat reference teaches the header field is a multipurpose internet mail extension content-type header field (Agranat: col. 7, lines 49-62).

The Agranat reference further teaches the system uses http request and response messages containing the format of the message (Agranat: col. 7, lines 49-62).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of data processing as taught by Beall while employing a MIME header field as taught by Agranat to indicate the format of the message (Agranat: col. 7, lines 49-62).

Claim 23 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Beall et al and Agranat et al.

Regarding claim 23, the method of claim 18, wherein the header field is a multipurpose internet mail extension content-type header field (Agranat: col. 7, lines 49-62).

Claims 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,169,992 by Beall et al (Applicant IDS) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,041,380 by LaBerge.

Regarding claim 14,

The Beall reference teaches a method in a data processing system (Beall: Figure 1, tags 112, 118; clients; col. 18, lines 54-62; Figure 8) for communicating across a firewall with a host (Beall: col. 22, lines 17-26).

The Bell reference does not explicitly state use of a primary or secondary bus.

The LaBerge reference teaches a bus system includes a primary bus and a secondary bus (LaBerge: col. 2, lines 66 - col. 3, 3).

The LaBerge reference further teaches this bus system overcomes the problems of a lower clock rate and thus forcing a slower and relatively more inefficient computer system, having decreased system throughput (LaBerge: col. 1, lines 23-29)

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of data processing as taught by Beall while employing multiple bus lines as taught by LaBerge to overcome the problems of a lower clock rate and thus forcing a slower and relatively more inefficient computer system, having decreased system throughput (LaBerge: col. 1, lines 23-29)

Claim 16 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Beall et al and LaBerge.

Regarding claim 16, the data processing system of claim 13, wherein the processor unit includes a plurality of processors (LaBerge: col. 2, lines 19-29).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number is (703)

305-0324. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155
brb
July 23, 2004

HOSAIN ALAM
ERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER